



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would in reality be accepted by Jewish Christians, if told of the conception of Jesus. Jesus' conception would have been by divine power, even if Joseph was the husband of Mary and the father of her child. And if a thoroughly Hebraic writing, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, can make Jesus speak of "My mother, the Holy Spirit," without denying that Mary was his mother, so could the Holy Spirit be thought of as the active principle of his conception, though Joseph was his father. Is it unreasonable or contrary to historical analogy or probability to suggest that so thoroughly spiritual a belief developed, under influences which we cannot trace, into an ignoring, then a denial of Mary's husband's share in the life of her wonderful child?

We have tried to argue the question, as our author does, upon the grounds of the testimony given and its trustworthiness, and to neglect all questions of profit or loss in seeking the truth. But, really, does it not add to the significance of Jesus in our Christian faith if we can believe that his holy birth and life gave new sanctity to marriage and fatherhood, as well as to a singular and unparalleled motherhood?

WILLIAM H. RYDER

ANDOVER, MASS.

An American Commentary on the Old Testament: The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. By PROFESSOR CHARLES RUFUS BROWN, D.D. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907. Pp. xxxvi + 256.

The Book of Jeremiah is long and as a whole monotonous and without clear and definite arrangement of contents, and thus presents not an easy or inspiring task for the commentator. Professor Brown has acquitted himself well in his undertaking. He has made diligent use of his predecessors and produced a most useful and helpful book. The original version has been studied with great care and the commentary while clearly primarily designed for English readers will be useful for the student of Hebrew.

A new translation is given rendering the abundant poetical sections in metrical form. All departures from the present Hebrew text, to restore the original through the use of the ancient versions or conjecture, are indicated by heavy type, and all glosses or insertions by an ingenious system of lines interrupting the text. Thus a clear and satisfactory idea of the original utterances of Jeremiah is given. A very full table of contents with dates of the deliverance and the publication and annotation of each section reveal also most clearly the character of the Book of Jeremiah.

In regard to the composition and authorship Professor Brown says:

Nearly one-half of the book consists of sermons more or less expanded from Jeremiah's utterances; a little more than one-quarter was written by Baruch and others in the way of a history of the prophet embodying a few of his words also, and the remaining one-quarter is made up for the most part of discourses by the admirers of Jeremiah and is based upon his own language and that of other prophets.

Turning now to the commentary proper we have tested it repeatedly in various passages and its excellence in interpretation has grown upon us. The exegesis is sound and judicious. We know on the whole of no better explanation in English of the prophecies of Jeremiah, and yet at the same time we feel constrained to point out blemishes in this work.

The commentary seems padded. Side by side are printed the Authorized Version and the new one of the author. Yet the departures from the former evident in the latter are also given in the notes. To such an extent is this repetition carried that a metrical rendering of six lines appears twice in exactly the same form on the same page. This padding has given the commentary bulk and this bulk evidently has compelled the use of small and unpleasant type throughout in the translations. It is an anachronism also to reproduce the Authorized Version—the American Revision should take its place if the author's new one was not sufficient.

The commentary is also marred by occasional little homilies and common-place observations which detract from its scholarly dignity. The work also fails in a good English style. We question whether the opening sentence of the introduction is grammatical. The heading, "The Ruined Loin Cloth of Jehovah," is offensive, and "The Unpaid Sorrows of Jeremiah's Life" is an obscure title for the prophet's imprecation of his birthday (21:14-18).

EDWARD L. CURTIS

NEW HAVEN, CONN.